

DAVID Y. IGE
GOVERNOR



DOUGLAS MURDOCK
CHIEF INFORMATION
OFFICER

OFFICE OF ENTERPRISE TECHNOLOGY SERVICES

P.O. BOX 119, HONOLULU, HAWAII 96810-0119
Ph: (808) 586-6000 | Fax: (808) 586-1922
ETS.HAWAII.GOV

August 19, 2019

The Honorable Ronald D. Kouchi,
President, and
Members of The Senate
Twenty-Ninth State Legislature
Hawaii State Capitol, Room 409
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

The Honorable Scott K. Saiki,
Speaker, and
Members of The House of Representatives
Twenty-Ninth State Legislature
Hawaii State Capitol, Room 431
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Dear President Kouchi, Speaker Saiki, and Members of the Legislature:

Pursuant to HRS section 27-43.6, which requires the Chief Information Officer to submit applicable independent verification and validation (IV&V) reports to the Legislature within ten days of receiving the report, please find attached the IV&V report the Office of Enterprise Technology Services received for the State of Hawaii Department of Human Services Systems Modernization Project.

In accordance with HRS section 93-16, this report may be viewed electronically at <http://ets.hawaii.gov> (see "Reports").

Sincerely,


Douglas Murdock (Aug 22, 2019)

DOUGLAS MURDOCK
Chief Information Officer
State of Hawai'i

Attachment (2)



Hawaii Department of Human Services Systems Modernization Project

Final IV&V Status Report
for Reporting Period: July 1 - 31, 2019

Final submitted: August 13, 2019

Overview

- [Executive Summary](#)
- [IV&V Findings and Recommendations](#)
- [IV&V Engagement Status](#)
- [Appendices](#)
 - [A – IV&V Criticality Ratings](#)
 - [B – Risk Identification Report](#)
 - [C – Acronyms and Glossary](#)
 - [D – Background Information](#)



Executive Summary




Executive Summary



During this reporting period the ASI achieved two significant deliverable milestones by receiving approval for BI-8 Technology Environments Specifications and producing the first full baselined version of the project schedule. Collaboration between the DHS PMO staff and the ASI increased. While IV&V still has concerns about the project schedule, improvements were made, and producing a baseline against which progress can be measured is a good step forward.




JAD/workgroup sessions continue, with eight sessions occurring in July and the Business Roundtable series kicking off, which has been positively received by the project. While IV&V notes improvement, concerns remain regarding the consistency of session facilitation, the eliciting of information from session SMEs, and varying levels of experience amongst session facilitators and functional track leads – all of which can potentially impact system design. Additionally, there is a lack of clarity amongst DHS and IV&V regarding the ASI's design approach as it relates to the development of use cases and functional design documents (FDD), and the 'big picture' of how everything fits together. IV&V continues to provide suggestions for improving the quality of the JADs/workgroup sessions with the ASI and the PMO to promote project success.

IV&V closed two risks and one concern during the July reporting period and did not open any new findings.

| May | Jun | Jul | Category | IV&V Observations |
|---|---|---|--------------------|---|
|  |  |  | Project Management | <p>IV&V closed two risks and one concern in the Project Management process area in July, signaling an improving project management practice and approach. IV&V's primary concern in this process area revolves around the schedule. While a baselined schedule was produced in July, there are still significant items to address, specifically regarding resource allocation and managing schedule details in both the master plan and in subplans. IV&V notes incremental improvements in project communication, and core project management processes such as risk management and decision management.</p> <p>The July 2019 reporting period risk rating for the Project Management process area remains Medium (yellow). This rating is driven by the need to see further sustained adherence to the improvements made by the project over the last 60 days, further evolution of the project schedule and how it is managed, as well as concerns related to productivity and staffing that need further investigation.</p> |

Executive Summary (cont.)




| May | Jun | Jul | Category | IV&V Observations |
|---|---|---|-------------------------------|---|
|  |  |  | Configuration and Development | <p>The July 2019 reporting period risk rating for the Configuration and Development process area remains Medium (yellow). Discussions at the project leadership level continue regarding long term architecture decisions that could impact project scope, schedule, and cost. IV&V is aware of these discussions but has not received documentation specific to the proposed changes.</p> <p>The primary concern in this process area is the lack of clarity regarding how the functional components of the solution will be documented and integrated. Additionally, how the project will review and approve all functional documentation is not clear.</p> <p>IV&V continues to attend JAD/workgroup sessions and is documenting observations and opportunities for improvement and communicating them to the PMO and the ASI.</p> |

IV&V Findings and Recommendations

IV&V Findings and Recommendations




As of the July 2019 reporting period, PCG has identified a total of 7 open findings (6 risks and 1 issue), 24 retired findings, and 1 open concern. Of the 7 open risks and issues, 4 are related to Project Management and 3 are related to Configuration and Development. IVV did not open any new risks during the July reporting period, while 1 concern and 2 risks were closed. The following figures provide a breakdown of our open risks and issues by priority and category.



IV&V Findings and Recommendations



The following figure provides a breakdown of all IV&V findings (risks, issues, concerns) by status (open, retired).



IV&V Findings and Recommendations



New Findings Opened During the Reporting Period

| # | Finding | Category |
|---|---|----------|
| | IV&V did not open any new findings during the July 2019 reporting period. | |

IV&V Findings and Recommendations



Findings Closed During the Reporting Period

| # | Finding | Category |
|----|--|--------------------|
| 22 | [Preliminary Concern] - Lack of a dedicated ASI Quality Assurance Team is resulting in extended deliverable reviews | Project Management |
| 31 | [Risk] - As result of the draft baseline project schedule having a large number of late tasks, the project does not have an accurate baseline of tasks or milestones that can be managed to, which could lead to schedule delays and resource overallocation. | Project Management |
| 32 | [Risk] – Due to inconsistent execution of the Decision Management process, the project may not be tracking all relevant information, which could lead to a lack of awareness and an inefficient use of time and resources | Project Management |

IV&V Findings and Recommendations




Preliminary Concerns Investigated During the Reporting Period

| # | Finding | Category |
|----|---|--------------------|
| 29 | Uncertainty and/or a lack of communication around long term architecture decisions could lead to unexpected impacts to project budget, schedule, system design, and planning decisions. | Project Management |

IV&V Findings and Recommendations



Project Management


| # | Key Findings | Criticality Rating |
|---|---|---|
| 2 | <p>Risk – Late Delivery of project deliverables may result in schedule delays. The number of late tasks in the schedule version (July 26, 2019) has been reduced to four tasks as reported by MS-Project Late Task Report. IVV acknowledges the ASI reviewed the critical path schedule with DHS and IVV this month and the ASI's positive changes to the schedule to include establishing the July 26, 2019 schedule as the baseline. In the schedule review meeting on 7/30/19 the ASI indicated the Conversion and KOLEA 90/10 Functionality schedules will be sub-plans to the Master Schedule, which are currently being updated by the ASI and not yet available for IVV to review. IVV will continue to monitor/review the schedules as they are published by the ASI and update this risk accordingly.</p> <p>IVV has lowered the severity of this risk to medium for the July reporting period.</p> |  |

| Recommendations | Progress |
|--|------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">Continue to manage and track the schedule to ensure deliverables are provided in a timely manner | In Process |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">Complete the Project Management Plan and deliver it for review to DHS and IV&V for review; attain approval of the PMP. | Complete |

IV&V Findings and Recommendations



Project Management


| # | Key Findings | Criticality Rating |
|---|--|---|
| 5 | <p>Risk – The Project Partnership Understanding (PPU) for the BES Project has not been approved by CMS, which may impact the project schedule and funding. The project's Action Item Number 190 was closed, and this activity is being reported within the ASI's weekly project status report. The ASI is working on the draft MEET checklists for DHS review.</p> <p>IVV maintains this is a low project risk to the project as of the July 2019 reporting period.</p> |  |

| Recommendations | Progress |
|--|------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">Continue dialogue with CMS regarding the project's approach to the PPU, IAPDU, and confirm that the MEELC requirements as related to this project. | In Process |

IV&V Findings and Recommendations



Project Management


| # | Key Findings | Criticality Rating |
|----|---|---|
| 26 | <p>Risk – Due to the lack of detail in the draft baseline schedule, unanticipated schedule delays may occur. IVV notes that many tasks (e.g., specific to JADs and Workgroups) in the next 90 days have been updated, added, and/or further decomposed since the last published version of the schedule. IVV acknowledges the positive changes made to the schedule details and will continue to monitor this item over the 90-day period from 7/19/19 through 10/18/19 to verify that the level of detail in the schedule continues to improve. Additionally, IVV notes that all data conversion tasks have been removed and will be replaced by other tasks and activities during August.</p> <p>IVV maintains this is a medium risk to the project as of the July reporting period.</p> |  |

| Recommendations | Progress |
|--|------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">IV&V understands DHS and the ASI's efforts to find balance when detailing out the project schedule. It is recommended that all tasks and activities should be decomposed by the individual project leads, and that subsequent details are properly added to the schedule for all current tasks, as well as those commencing within the next 90 days, weekly on a rolling wave basis. | In Process |

IV&V Findings and Recommendations



Project Management

| # | Key Findings | Criticality Rating |
|----|---|---|
| 27 | <p>Risk - The draft baseline schedule lacks proper resource loading which could result in unanticipated schedule delays. While it is noted that the ASI has started to address this, most named resources are still overallocated over the next 90 days, as depicted on the Project Plan's Task Resource Sheet. Of significance is the fact that there are currently 9 positions without named resources that are also overallocated over the next 90 days. IVV will continue to monitor this risk to verify that staff resourcing within the schedule is accurately depicted.</p> <p>IV&V maintains this is a medium risk to the project as of the July reporting period.</p> |  |

| Recommendations | Progress |
|--|------------|
| <p>It is recommended that the ASI perform, at a minimum, the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Add all project resources to the project schedule.• Assign all project resources in the schedule to as to all current and planned tasks and activities.• Level load for the next 90 days to ensure the accuracy and attainability of the schedule. | In process |

IV&V Findings and Recommendations



Project Management

| # | Key Findings | Criticality Rating |
|----|---|--------------------|
| 31 | [Closed] Risk - As result of the draft baseline project schedule having a large number of late tasks, the project does not have an accurate baseline of tasks or milestones that can be managed to, which could lead to schedule delays and resource overallocation. IVV validates that the number of late tasks in the latest schedule version (190726) has been reduced to four tasks, and the ASI has acknowledged that this is the baseline schedule they'll be managing to moving forward. As such, IVV is closing this risk . However, IVV will continue to monitor updates made to the schedule, ensuring that all deliverables and milestones are accurately tracked within the schedule. Particular attention will be paid to items not yet fully flushed out, including but not limited to Data Conversion and the 90/10 accelerated items. | Closed |

| Recommendations | Progress |
|---|----------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">DHS and the ASI should work together to understand and update and re-schedule all late tasks as a component of the baselining effort, to ensure schedule attainability. | Complete |

IV&V Findings and Recommendations



Project Management



| # | Key Findings | Criticality Rating |
|----|---|--------------------|
| 32 | [Closed] Risk – Due to inconsistent execution of the Decision Management process, the project may not be tracking all relevant information, which could lead to a lack of awareness and an inefficient use of time and resources. IVV is closing this risk , as it has been addressed by the ASI. The SharePoint Decision Log has been updated to require data entry in required fields and has gone back to fill in missing data on existing Decisions entries. | Closed |

| Recommendations | Progress |
|---|-----------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Determine which fields in the Decision Log should be mandatory vs optional.• Force entry going forward for all needed fields, and audit the data entered into the log to ensure consistent use.• Also consider backfilling missing data in the log at the earliest possible juncture, before the data to be entered is forgotten. | Complete |

IV&V Findings and Recommendations



Configuration and Development


| # | Key Findings | Criticality Rating |
|----|--|---|
| 12 | Risk – Changes in direction regarding the preferred platform for portal development may impact project schedule and cost. IVV has no update on this finding but maintains this is a low risk as of the July 2019 reporting period. |  |
| 13 | Issue – Differing ASI and ESI expectations regarding DDI environments may impact project schedule and cost. IV&V notes that DHS and Unisys closed the project risk titled 'Differing expectations between ASI/ESI' based upon DHS decision (#96 in the Project Decision Log) that directs and remunerates the ASI to provision cloud environments. While IVV acknowledges this decision and apparent agreement between DHS and the ASI, we will continue to track this issue until the impacts to project budget and schedule are known. IVV maintains this is a medium risk as of the July 2019 reporting period. |  |

| Recommendations | Progress |
|--|------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">Complete the Change Request (CR) process to obtain a Rough Order of Magnitude (ROM) estimate and/or impact analysis as appropriate. | In Process |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">ASI work with the State to reach a common understanding of the requirements for the BES DDI environments.ESI and ASI work together to formulate an environment strategy that will meet the project platform and development needs and minimize impact to the State. | In Process |

IV&V Findings and Recommendations



Configuration and Development

| # | Key Findings | Criticality Rating |
|----|---|---|
| 16 | <p>Risk – Lack of clear understanding of DDI approach may reduce effectiveness of JARs and JADs.</p> <p>There is a lack of clarity amongst DHS and IV&V regarding Unisys' design approach as it relates to the development of use cases and functional design documents (FDD), and the 'big picture' of how they fit together. As a result, the project logged action item (#473) on 7/10/2019, titled 'DHS wants to know how design Use Cases/ FDDs are being put together for a comprehensive view of this information'. The 7/31/2019 Project status report, slide 7, shows an in-progress activity, 'Work on process to show the big picture'.</p> <p>IVV maintains this is a medium risk as of the July reporting period.</p> |  |

| Recommendations | Progress |
|--|------------|
| <p>PCG recommends one or more of the following to mitigate this risk:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• SI provide an additional DDI approach overview session for stakeholders and allow for Q&A• SI provide DDI approach documentation/materials for stakeholders to review and/or refresh their knowledge on demand; the materials could be made available via the project SharePoint• SI and DHS accelerate review, resubmission and approval of an acceptable DDI Plan DED to facilitate submission of DDI Plan deliverable• SI submit DDI Plan deliverable and make it easily available to all project stakeholders | In Process |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• PCG recommends each new JAD series begin with a brief overview of the DDI approach, including a description of the tools being utilized (use cases, function design documents, technical design documents, etc.), the goals of the session, as well as guidance on how to best provide feedback on what's being shown. | New |

IV&V Status

IV&V Engagement Status



| IV&V Engagement Area | May | June | July | Comments |
|--|-----|------|------|---|
| IV&V Budget | | | | |
| IV&V Schedule | | | | |
| IV&V Deliverables | | | | PCG submitted the final June IV&V Monthly Status Report. |
| Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) IV&V Progress Reports | | | | The first quarterly CMS Eligibility and Enrollment (E&E) IV&V Progress Report is anticipated to be delivered in October 2019 (refer to the PPU submitted to CMS). |
| CMS Milestone Reviews | | | | The first CMS Milestone Review date has not yet been determined. |
| IV&V Staffing | | | | |
| IV&V Scope | | | | |

| Engagement Rating Legend | | |
|--|--|--|
| The engagement area is within acceptable parameters. | The engagement area is somewhat outside acceptable parameters. | The engagement area poses a significant risk to the IV&V project quality and requires immediate attention. |



- IV&V activities in July reporting period:
 - Completed – June Monthly Status Report
 - Submitted – Comments on BI-06 DDI Plan, and BI-08 Technology Environments Specifications, BI-19 Complete and Final Test Plan, and BI-24 Organizational Change Management Plan
 - Ongoing analysis of Medicaid Eligibility and Enrollment Toolkit (MEET) requirements applicable to BES project
 - Ongoing – Review Deliverables for BES project
 - Ongoing – Attend ASI project meetings, including JADs and Workgroups (see [Additional Inputs](#) pages for details)
- Planned IV&V activities for August reporting period:
 - Continued discussion and analysis of Medicaid Eligibility and Enrollment Toolkit (MEET) requirements applicable to BES project with DHS PMO and BES Project Director
 - Ongoing – Observe BES JAD and Workgroup sessions
 - Ongoing – Observe Weekly Project Status meetings
 - Ongoing – Observe bi-weekly BES Project Risk and Issue meetings
 - Ongoing – Monthly IV&V findings meetings with Unisys
 - Ongoing – Participate in weekly DHS and IV&V Touch Base meetings
 - Ongoing – Review BES artifacts and deliverables

Deliverables Reviewed



| Deliverable Name | Deliverable Date | Version |
|---|--|--------------|
| BI-02 Project Status Report Deliverable | Weekly | |
| BI-05 Project Schedule Deliverable Baseline Draft Re-Assessment | 190705 Draft Baselined | N/A |
| BI-05 Project Schedule Deliverable – Draft and Baseline | 190705 Draft 190719 Baseline 190726 Baseline | |
| BI-05 Project Schedule Deliverable Baseline Draft Re-Assessment | 190726 Baseline | |
| BI-06 DD Plan Draft Re-Assessment | Multiple | |
| BI-08 Technical Environment Specifications – CNV21 Re-Assessment(s) | 6/26/2019 7/15/2019 | V1.4 V1.6 |
| BI-08 Technical Environment Specifications – DEV02B Re-Assessment | 6/26/2019 7/15/2019 | V1.4 V1.6 |
| BI-08 Technical Environment Specifications – DEV21 Re-Assessment | 6/26/2019 7/15/2019 | V1.4 V1.6 |
| BI-08 Technical Environment Specifications – DRX21 Re-Assessment | 6/26/2019 7/15/2019 | V1.4 V1.6 |
| BI-08 Technical Environment Specifications – PRD21 Re-Assessment | 6/26/2019 7/15/2019 | V1.4 V1.6 |
| BI-08 Technical Environment Specifications – SIT21 Re-Assessment | 6/26/2019 7/15/2019 | V1.4 V1.6 |
| BI-08 Technical Environment Specifications – STG21 Re-Assessment | 6/26/2019 7/15/2019 | V1.4 V1.6 |

Deliverables Reviewed



| Deliverable Name | Deliverable Date | Version |
|--|------------------|---------|
| BI-08 Technical Environment Specifications – TRN21 Re-Assessment | 6/26/2019 | V1.4 |
| | 7/15/2019 | V1.6 |
| BI-08 Technical Environment Specifications – UAT21 Re-Assessment | 6/26/2019 | V1.4 |
| | 7/15/2019 | V1.6 |
| BI-19 Complete and Final Test Plan Re-assessment(s) | 6/25/2019 | V1.0 |
| | 7/31/2019 | V1.2 |
| BI-24 OCM Plan | 6/28/2019 | V1.5 |

Additional Inputs – Artifacts



| Artifact Name | Artifact Date | Version |
|---------------------------------------|--|---------|
| Decision Log | 7/3/2019 7/10/2019 7/17/2019 7/24/2019 7/31/2019 | N/A |
| Functional Design Action Item Process | 7/2/2019 | N/A |
| BES Risk and Issue Log (Excel) | 7/3/2019 7/10/2019 7/17/2019 7/24/2019 7/31/2019 | |
| JAD Calendar | 7/3/2019 7/10/2019 7/17/2019 7/24/2019 7/31/2019 | N/A |
| BES RFP and Unisys BAFO | | |






Meetings and/or Sessions Attended/Observed:

- Project Status Meetings x5 (7/3/19, 7/10/19, 7/17/19, 7/24/19, 7/31/19)
- BESSD PMO, IV&V Weekly Meeting x5 (7/3/19, 7/10/19, 7/17/19, 7/24/19, 7/31/19)
- Internal PCG Team Meetings x9 (7/1/19, 7/1/19, 7/8/19, 7/8/19, 7/11/19, 7/15/19, 7/22/19, 7/25/19, 7/29/19)
- Monthly Change Control Board (7/10/19)
- Project Schedule Review x2 (7/3/19, 7/30/19)
- JAD Effectiveness Meeting (7/3/19)
- Business Roundtable Meeting (7/25)
- IV&V/Unisys Findings Review x2 (7/1/19, 7/17/19)
- MDM, Consent Management, Referral Management Workgroup (7/30/19)
- Administrative Hearings Workgroup Meetings (7/25/19)
- Common Functions Workgroup Meetings x2 (7/16/19, 7/30/19)
- ECM Workgroup Meetings x2 (7/8/19, 7/15/19)
- CORE JAD 1 x3 (7/23/19, 7/24/19, 7/31/19)
- Self Service Portal JAD x6 (7/9/19, 7/10/19, 7/11/19, 7/16/19, 7/17/19, 7/18/19)
- Financials Workgroup Meetings (7/31/19)
- BI-06 and BI-08 DCF Review Meeting (7/18)
- BI-19 Test Plan DCF Review Meeting (7/22/19)

Appendices



Appendix A – IV&V Criticality Ratings

| Criticality Rating | Definition |
|---|---|
|  | A high rating is assigned if there is a possibility of substantial impact to product quality, scope, cost, or schedule. A major disruption is likely and the consequences would be unacceptable. A different approach is required. Mitigation strategies should be evaluated and acted upon immediately. |
|  | A medium rating is assigned if there is a possibility of moderate impact to product quality, scope, cost, or schedule. Some disruption is likely and a different approach may be required. Mitigation strategies should be evaluated and implemented as soon as feasible. |
|  | A low rating is assigned if there is a possibility of slight impact to product quality, scope, cost, or schedule. Minimal disruption is likely and some oversight is most likely needed to ensure that the risk remains low. Mitigation strategies should be considered for implementation when possible. |

Appendix B – Findings Log



- The complete Findings Log for the BES Project is provided in a separate file.

Appendix C – Acronyms and Glossary



| Acronym | Definition |
|---------|---|
| APD | Advance Planning Document |
| ASI | Application System Integrator |
| BES | Benefits Eligibility Solution |
| CCWIS | Comprehensive Child Welfare Information System |
| CM | Configuration Management |
| CMMI | Capability Maturity Model Integration |
| CMS | Center for Medicare and Medicaid Services |
| CR | Change Request |
| DDI | Design, Development and Implementation |
| DED | Deliverable Expectation Document |
| DHS | Hawaii Department of Human Services |
| DLV | Deliverable |
| E&E | Eligibility and Enrollment |
| EA | Enterprise Architecture |
| ECM | Enterprise Content Management (FileNet and DataCap) |
| ESI | Enterprise System Integrator (Platform Vendor) |
| ETS | State of Hawaii Office of Enterprise Technology Services |
| FIPS | Federal Information Processing Standard |
| HIPAA | Health Information Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 |
| IDM | Identity and Access Management (from KOLEA to State Hub) |
| IEEE | Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers |
| IES | Integrated Eligibility Solution |
| ITIL | Information Technology Infrastructure Library |



Appendix C – Acronyms and Glossary

| Acronym | Definition |
|---------|---|
| IV&V | Independent Verification and Validation |
| KOLEA | Kauhale On-Line Eligibility Assistance |
| M&O | Maintenance & Operations |
| MEELC | Medicaid Eligibility and Enrollment Life Cycle |
| MEET | Medicaid Eligibility and Enrollment Toolkit |
| MOU | Memorandum of Understanding |
| MQD | Hawaii Department of Human Services MedQuest Division |
| NIST | National Institute of Standards and Technology |
| OE | Operating Environment |
| OIT | Department of Human Services Office of Information Technology |
| PIP | Performance/Process Improvement Plan |
| PMBOK® | Project Management Body of Knowledge |
| PMI | Project Management Institute |
| PMO | Project/Program Management Office |
| PMP | Project Management Plan |
| QA | Quality Assurance |
| QM | Quality Management |
| RFP | Request for Proposal |
| ROM | Rough Order of Magnitude |
| RMP | Requirements Management Plan |
| RTM | Requirements Traceability Matrix |
| SEI | Software Engineering Institute |
| SLA | Service-Level Agreement |
| SME | Subject Matter Expert |

Appendix C – Acronyms and Glossary



| Acronym | Definition |
|---------|---|
| SOA | Service Oriented Architecture |
| SOW | Statement of Work, Scope of Work |
| VVP | Software Verification and Validation Plan |
| XLC | Expedited Life Cycle |

Appendix D – Background Information



Systems Modernization Project

The DHS Enterprise Program Roadmap includes contracting with three separate vendors with the following high-level scope:

- ESI or Platform Vendor – responsible for the shared technology and services required for multiple Application vendors to implement and support functionality that leverages the DHS Enterprise Platform.
- ASI or ASI Vendor – responsible for the DDI of the Benefits Eligibility Solution (BES Project) enhancing the currently implemented Medicaid E&E Solution (KOLEA) and providing support for the combined Solutions.
- CCWIS Vendor – responsible for the DDI of the CCWIS Solution to meet the needs of child welfare services and adult protective services (CCWIS Project) and providing support for the Solution.

Systems Modernization IV&V Project

IV&V performs objective assessments of the design, development/configuration and implementation (DDI) of DHS' System Modernization Projects. DHS has identified three high-risk areas where IV&V services are required:

- Transition of M&O from DHS' incumbent vendor to the ESI and ASI vendors
- BES DDI
- CCWIS DDI

On the BES DDI Project, IV&V is responsible for:

- Evaluating efforts performed by the Project (processes, methods, activities) for consistency with federal requirements and industry best practices and standards
- Reviewing or validating the work effort performed and deliverables produced by the ASI vendor as well as that of DHS to ensure alignment with project requirements
- Anticipating project risks, monitoring project issues and risks, and recommending potential risk mitigation strategies and issue resolutions throughout the project's life cycle
- Developing and providing independent project oversight reports to DHS, ASI vendors, State of Hawaii Office of Enterprise Technology Services (ETS) and DHS' Federal partners

Appendix D – Background Information



What is Independent Verification and Validation (IV&V)?

- Oversight by an independent third party that assesses the project against industry standards to provide an unbiased view to stakeholders
- The goal of IV&V is to help the State get the solution they want based on requirements and have it built according to best practices
- IV&V helps improve design visibility and traceability and identifies (potential) problems early
- IV&V objectively identifies risks and communicates to project leadership for risk management

PCG's Eclipse IV&V® Technical Assessment Methodology

- Consists of a 4-part process made up of the following areas:
 1. **Discovery** – Discovery consists of reviewing documentation, work products and deliverables, interviewing project team members, and determining applicable standards, best practices and tools.
 2. **Research and Analysis** – Research and analysis is conducted in order to form an objective opinion.
 3. **Clarification** – Clarification from project team members is sought to ensure agreement and concurrence of facts between the State, the Vendor, and PCG.
 4. **Delivery of Findings** – Findings, observations, and risk assessments are documented in this monthly report and the accompanying Findings and Recommendations log. These documents are then shared with project leadership on both the State and Vendor side for them to consider and take appropriate action on.

IV&V Assessment Categories for the BES Project

- | | |
|--|------------------------------|
| • Project Management | • Security and Privacy |
| • Requirements Analysis & Management | • Testing |
| • System Design | • OCM and Knowledge Transfer |
| • Configuration and Development | • Pilot Test Deployment |
| • Integration and Interface Management | • Deployment |



www.publicconsultinggroup.com

| Finding Number | Title | Reporter | Finding Type | Identified Date | Category | Observation | Significance | Recommendation | Event Horizon | Impact | Probability | Priority | Analyst Priority | Finding Status | Date Retired | Status Update | Client Comments | Vendor Comments | |
|----------------|---|----------|----------------|-----------------|-------------------------------|---|--|--|---------------|--------|-------------|----------|------------------|----------------|--------------|--|--|--|---|
| 29 | Uncertainty and/or a lack of communication around long term architecture decisions could lead to unexpected impacts to project budget, schedule, system design, and planning decisions. | mfors | Concern | 5/28/2019 | Project Management | Some platform and BES system architecture decisions have yet to be made and socialized to the project. For example, the ASI and DHS have stated that they have reached agreement that the project will move forward with implementing two Siebel instances (one for KOLEA, one for BES), but this is not currently reflected in the project change log or the project decision log. It remains unclear if the details of the rationale for this decision or the plan for integrating the two instances post go-live have been thoroughly vetted and/or documented. Further, there may be some uncertainty around whether when/if all environments (including KOLEA and BES production) will be moved to the cloud. | The current project architecture and design should be as representative and inclusive of all known future solution plans as possible. As an example, if KOLEA and BES are to move to a single instance of Siebel in the future, planning for that integration should be incorporated into the project now. If such significant future changes are not planned for now, the project is likely to see increased complexity, rework, and costs when integrating the two systems in the future. | It is recommended that DHS request ASI perform due diligence in any recommendation for foundational architecture change decisions. Additionally, the project should vet possible architectural change impacts to platform, M&O, MQD, and BES systems before finalizing architectural decisions. | ASAP | 0 | 0 | N/A | NA | Open | | 7/31/19 - During a 7/30/19 ASI/DHS schedule review meeting, the PMO was surprised to find that some environments they had expected to be in the cloud were scheduled to be created on-premises. In response, DHS logged decision #96 in the project decision log regarding Unisys creating cloud environments, and DHS reimbursing them. IVV is awaiting additional information regarding changes to the currently proposed architectural approach. 6/26/19 - While DHS has indicated architecture changes are currently being discussed, no clear details have been made available to IVV. Until such details are provided, IVV will continue to track this as a preliminary concern. | | 06/11/19 S Brown: The ASI requests clarity on what long term architectural decisions are being referred to. | |
| 27 | The draft baseline schedule lacks proper resource loading which could result in unanticipated schedule delays | Darren | Finding - Risk | 5/28/2019 | Project Management | The draft baseline schedule does not include all resource assignments, and most of the lead resources that are added to the schedule are largely overallocated. The RFP and the ASI proposal both require a fully resource-loaded project schedule. - ALL lead project staff are all overallocated through the next 90 days. Overallocation ranges from 16 hrs/day to 136 hrs/day. The ASI has stated that they will only track resource assignments for lead staff, which obfuscates transparency. - 'Unknown' project staff (Identify Mgmt Lead, Integration Lead, Siebel Dev Lead, OPA Lead, BI Architect, Data Architect, Tech Writer) are ALL overallocated. Overallocation ranges from 24-36 hrs/day - There are over 68,000 hours of work assigned to 'Unisys'. - There are over 19,000 hours of work assigned to 'DHS'. - There are over 7,000 hours of work assigned to 'DHS Technical'. | The project's ability to understand 'which' staff are working on 'what' project tasks is obscured. Such extreme overallocation of resources can result in unplanned schedule delays, and unobtainable task end dates and milestones. This condition in the schedule is an indication that one or more of the following may be occurring: there may not be enough resources to accomplish the planned tasks in accordance with the schedule; tasks may not have been fully decomposed to the appropriate level; resource assignments may not have been fully planned out and/or assigned. | It is recommended that the ASI perform, at a minimum, the following: - Add all project resources to the project schedule. - Assign all project resources in the schedule to as to all current and planned tasks and activities. - Level load for the next 90 days to ensure the accuracy and attainability of the schedule. - If, upon completing the above, resource gaps exist, the project may want need to consider bringing on additional resources as needed to meet the schedule. | July 2019 | 4 | 2 | Medium | Med | Open | | 07/31/2019 - While it is noted that the ASI has started to address this, most named resources are still overallocated over the next 90 days, as depicted on the Project Plan's Task Resource Sheet. Of significance is the fact that there are currently 9 positions without named resources that are also overallocated over the next 90 days. IVV will continue to monitor this risk to verify that staff resourcing within the schedule is accurately depicted. 06/28/2019 - IVV validates that this condition still persists in the latest published version of the schedule (190614). IVV will re-review to determine if this condition persists when an updated schedule is published. IVV notes that DHS and the ASI are collaboratively working to identify an appropriate level of resourcing tasks and activities in the project schedule, and that this finding was included in the DHS Action Plan for the ASI in June 2019. IV&V maintains this is a medium risk to the project as of the June reporting period. | | 06/11/19 S Brown: The ASI will continue to update and level resource allocations. | |
| 26 | Due to the lack of detail in the draft baseline schedule, unanticipated schedule delays may occur | Darren | Finding - Risk | 5/28/2019 | Project Management | The tasks and activities listed in the project schedule for the next 90 days have not been decomposed to a level to where actual progress can accurately be measured. IVV has become aware that some project leads are using Excel, Trello, or other tools to track task and activity details within their respective areas of responsibility. | If all tasks and activities are not thoroughly decomposed in a common manner using MS Project, it is highly likely that sub-plans recorded elsewhere will at times not be in sync with and/or congruent with overall project plans. This type of approach often times results in unplanned activity and/or project delays, and hinders the project's ability to sufficiently plan for the appropriate resources to be involved in each task. | IVV continues to recommend that all tasks and activities are thoroughly decomposed by the individual project leads, and that subsequent details are properly added to the schedule for all current tasks, as well as those commencing within the next 90 days, weekly on a rolling wave basis. | July 2019 | 3 | 3 | Medium | Med | Open | | 07/31/2019 - IVV notes that many tasks (e.g., specific to JADs and Workgroups) in the next 90 days have been updated, added, and/or further decomposed since the last published version of the schedule. IVV acknowledges the positive changes made to the schedule details and will continue to monitor this item over the 90-day period from 7/19/19 through 10/18/19 to verify that the level of detail in the schedule continues to improve. Additionally, IVV notes that all data conversion tasks have been removed and will be replaced by other tasks and activities during August. 06/28/2019 - IVV validates that this condition still persists in the latest published version of the schedule (190614). IVV will re-review to determine if this condition persists when an updated schedule is published. IVV notes that DHS and the ASI are collaboratively working to identify an appropriate level of task details in the project schedule, and that this finding was included in the DHS Action Plan for the ASI in June 2019. | | 06/11/19 S Brown: The ASI agreed to add additional detail once the schedule is baselined, as discussed with the client. | |
| 16 | Lack of clear understanding of SI DDI approach may reduce effectiveness of JARs and JADs | mfors | Finding - Risk | 12/17/2018 | Configuration and Development | Several DHS stakeholders have commented that the SI Design, Development, and Implementation (DDI) approach is unclear. While stakeholders can observe SI activity and have participated in some SI activities, they do not understand how it all fits together and some activity objectives seem unclear. The SI conducted a DDI approach overview session during an initial JAR session, however not all stakeholders were present. IVV did not locate any DDI approach documentation or materials that could be referenced by stakeholders who may have missed to the overview session, by new members of the team, or by other interested parties. | Lack of stakeholder understanding and buy-in to the SI DDI approach and project activity objectives may reduce the effectiveness of JAR and JAD sessions as well as other BES project activities and decisions. | PCG recommends one or more of the following to mitigate this risk: • SI provide an additional DDI approach overview session for stakeholders and allow for Q&A • SI provide DDI approach documentation/materials for stakeholders to review and/or refresh their knowledge on demand; the materials could be made available via the project SharePoint • SI submit DDI Plan deliverable and make it easily available to all project stakeholders | 1/31/19 | 4 | 3 | High | Med | Open | | 7/31/19 - There is a lack of clarity amongst DHS and IV&V regarding Unisys' design approach as it relates to the development of use cases and functional design documents (FDD), and the 'big picture' of how they fit together. As a result, the project logged action item (#473) on 7/10/2019, titled 'DHS wants to know how design Use Cases/ FDDs are being put together for a comprehensive view of this information'. The 7/31/2019 Project status report, slide 7, shows an in-progress activity, 'Work on process to show the big picture'. 6/26/19 - ASI efforts to provide packets/templates and other information before JAD and workgroup sessions has improved understanding of the ASI DDI approach, however, DHS leadership and some participants have stated that pre-read materials are not provided soon enough for them to properly prepare. Examples include: Eligibility JAD 1 Session 2 Agenda - Sent - 6/18, 4pm - Session - 6/19, 9am Eligibility JAD 1 Session 5 Agenda - Sent - 6/25, 6pm - Session - 6/26, 9am Eligibility JAD 1 Session 6 Agenda - Sent - 6/26, 8:30 pm - Session - 6/27, 1pm Common Functions JAD (Agenda; Use Cases; Functional Design) - Sent - 3pm, 6/27 - Session - 8am, 6/28 Common Functions JAD (Agenda; Use Cases; Functional Design) - Sent - 11am, 6/20 - Session - 8am, 6/21 Administrative Hearings Workgroup Agenda - Sent - 8:30pm, 6/26 - Session - 9am, 6/27 Administrative Hearings Workgroup Agenda - Sent - 5pm, 6/27 - Session - 9am, 6/28 Further, some confusion around the ASI's DDI approach continues. For example, during the first Eligibility JAD 16/18/19, DHS SMEs asked to stop the session and for | 1/7/19: Note. During the 01-02-18 [sic] status meeting, DHS did not decline the offer and made suggestions. To my understanding, Unisys offered to present the orientation during each JAD session. It was suggested by DHS that the pre-JAD packet be placed in the SharePoint project site. For new participants in the JADs, a separate orientation before the JAD should be held for those new participants. | 06/11/19 S Brown: The ASI disagrees with this finding and associated rating. The DDI plan has been presented to the client in its entirety and the ASI is executing delivery as detailed in the plan. In addition, there have been numerous presentations and discussions on the methodology to the client. The ASI is in the process of updating the deliverable based on the DCF comments, with many of them from IV and that have been very high level and needed clarification on how the comments apply to the specifics of this project. There are two remaining sections along with general comments still due to the client this week. Walkthroughs will be scheduled as needed. | 1/3/19 - Unisys (Bill Thornton) reports that they offered to provide the approach materials in the pre-JAD package and conduct an overview prior to each JAD session, however, DHS has declined this offer. |

| Finding Number | Title | Reporter | Finding Type | Identified Date | Category | Observation | Significance | Recommendation | Event Horizon | Impact | Probability | Priority | Analyst Priority | Finding Status | Date Retired | Status Update | Client Comments | Vendor Comments |
|----------------|--|----------|-----------------|-----------------|-------------------------------|--|--|---|---|--------|-------------|----------|------------------|----------------|---|--|---|-----------------|
| 13 | Differing ASI and ESI expectations regarding DDI environments may impact project schedule and cost | mfors | Finding - Issue | 11/28/2018 | Configuration and Development | <p>The ASI has requested development environments to support BES DDI that the existing on-premise infrastructure may not support. There is discussion that the underlying challenge relates solely to the number of environments, in fact, the ASI is not requesting more environments than specified in their BAFO. The ASI is requesting development environments for the BES Project that are aligned with the platform and application software upon which the BES solution will reside in production. It is IV&V understanding that the existing KOLEA development environments have not been kept up to date (e.g., tool and operating system patches and updates) and that a concerted effort to bring those environments current would be necessary if the ASI could use the KOLEA environments. However, since the BES solution is planned to be implemented on a higher version (version 17) of Siebel than KOLEA uses (version 15), the ASI cannot use existing KOLEA environments even if those environments were up to date for their platform version(s). The Project requires development environments that align with the future production environment and platform. The cost impact of acquiring suitable development environments could be substantial. The Project is tracking this and has rated the ESI and Platform Items as Yellow in the most current status report: powerhalence_IV&V considers this</p> | <p>If the ASI is constrained by having to develop the BES solution in the existing KOLEA development environments (regardless whether those environments are up to date), the quality of the BES solution may be negatively affected. The BES solution could not be fully tested on a production-like platform prior to roll-out or go-live. Nuances between Siebel versions, among other supporting software versions, between development and production can cause unexpected defects ranging from catastrophic to annoying. Creating suitable development environments for BES is a task that, from all appearances, was not anticipated by the ESI or DHS. Contract details notwithstanding, creation of new or re-purposed environments is complex and will require time and effort from DHS, the ESI, and the ASI. The contract details, particularly around the responsibility for the cost of creating BES development environments, and potential increased licensing fees may ultimately result in increased costs to DHS. Both of these impacts may subsequently cause delay to the BES project schedule.</p> | <p>• ASI work with the State to reach a common understanding of the requirements for the BES DDI environments. • ESI and ASI work together to formulate an environment strategy that will meet the project platform and development needs and minimize impact to the State.</p> | Q1 2019 | 3 | 5 | High | Med | Open | <p>7/29/19 - The project has closed out a similar project risk 'differing expectations between ASI/ESI' as they feel the differences have been clarified. DHS logged decision #96 in the project decision log stating that in order for Unisys to move forward with offshore development work, they should provision cloud environments and DHS will reimburse them for the work. IVV acknowledges the decision and the agreement between the parties, however, will continue to track this risk until the impacts to project budget and schedule are known. 6/27/19 - Documented environment plans have yet to be shared with IVV. IVV is unaware if ESI responsibilities and contractual obligations upon implementation of the new environment plan have been fully resolved. Until IVV has the opportunity to review this documentation, this remains a medium risk to the project. The ASI has stated that there is no difference between ASI and ESI expectations as the ASI BAFO and contract clearly states 10 environments. 5/31/19 - DHS has indicated that the ASI has provided them with a revised environment plan, however, this revised plan has not been shared with IV&V, and nothing was entered into the Decision Log in relation to this topic in May. IVV maintains this is a medium risk as of the May 2019 reporting period. 4/29/19 - The ASI has indicated that their original environment strategy may change, and internal discussions of these changes are ongoing. These changes could significantly impact ESI and ASI responsibilities and ultimately impact the project budget. IVV recommends DHS present the ASI work quickly to self-fund and vet this plan. 7/31/19 - IVV has no update on this finding, but maintains this is a low risk as of the July 2019 reporting period. 6/27/19 - The ASI has reported they are working to update the Adobe change request (CR) that includes migrating the KOLEA portal from LifeRay to Adobe at no additional cost to DHS and will likely seek approval at the next CCB meeting. IVV will continue to monitor this finding until the CR is published and IVV can review. 5/22/19: DHS and ASI negotiation with regard to this change request are ongoing. Various options are being discussed but no decisions have been finalized, and there has been limited communication to the project. IVV is opening two new findings related to this one, focusing on the communication around outstanding change requests (#28), and long-term architecture planning (#29). IVV maintains this is a low risk as of the May 2019 reporting period. 4/29/19 - The ASI has indicated that they may be able to lower the original cost estimate of the move from LifeRay to Adobe. However, no additional details on this CR or PIA are available on the project SharePoint site. IVV will continue to monitor this risk and review details as they become available, and maintains this is a Low risk to the project in the April 2019 reporting period. 3/27/19 - IV&V has no update to this risk and is not aware of further PIA details being submitted. 2/28/19 - Recent DHS analysis of the PIA estimate indicates a discrepancy between the hourly rate quoted in the Unisys proposal and rates quoted in the PIA. DHS has requested the ASI provide a more detailed PIA with itemized costs. 7/13/19 - A Project Impact Analysis (PIA) was 7/31/2019 - The project's Action Item Number 190 was closed and this activity is being reported within the ASI's weekly project status report. The ASI is working on the draft MEET checklists for DHS review. 6/26/2019 - No change; the Project Team logged Action Item Number 190 which documents the action for Unisys to review the MEET Checklists and draft a list of those MEET Criteria that apply and then review with DHS. The action item is in the status of "in progress" with the next step due date of 06/28/2019 for Unisys to provide the date they will be ready to review the MEET Checklist Criteria with DHS. IVV maintains this is a low project risk for the June 2019 reporting period. 5/31/2019 - The Unisys project team is moving forward identifying the MEET requirements that may apply for this project. However, CMS has not provided written guidance regarding the approach or applicability of the MEET requirements for this project. Without clarity from CMS, IVV fully supports Unisys' and DHS' approach to align the project's requirements to the MEET criteria now. This may significantly reduce the resource needs to do this as the project progresses through the SDLC, if CMS does require the use of the MEET Checklists. IVV maintains this is a low project risk for the May 2019 reporting period. 4/30/2019 - CMS indicated to the BES/PMO this month that the MEET Checklists may be optional. IVV will keep this risk open until there is clarity from the BES/PMO regarding the identification of any CMS requirements to secure the funding for the KOLEA Enhancements. The priority of this risk was changed to low in the April 2019 reporting period.</p> | <p>1/4/2019, Doug Murdock, CIO - ETS: DHS is aware of the environments issue and we are working with Oracle, Unisys and BIAS to find a resolution. BIAS and Unisys have indicated a need for more environments than expected and we have a disagreement about exactly what the contracts require or allow. We had a big meeting at Unisys to discuss the problem and BIAS and Unisys have submitted preliminary solutions. Both solutions involve setting up BES environments on the cloud and they require additional funding. I plan to meet with both next week and I have a meeting with Oracle on Thursday to discuss price of cloud capacity. We recently signed the year 2 extension for BIAS and there is a priced option for them to build the environments. I would also note that Unisys has a deliverable for their environments plan that we have not received yet, so I believe requests for environments without an approved plan is premature.</p> | <p>06/11/19 S Brown: The ASI has provisioned four Oracle cloud environments to reduce impact to the schedule and project. The ASI has statuted progress of these build outs as part of the weekly status report and meeting. The ASI has worked with the ESI to develop and support a POC of lift and shift capability of the existing Kolea environments to the cloud. The client has escalated issues to the ESI in a timely manner. 3/13/19 Bill Thornton, Unisys: -ASI has submitted a proposed solution for the environment issue – not a no-cost/CR. 2/6/19, Bill Thornton, Unisys: Findings and Recommendations (#13) – Configuration and Development DEV environment –This issue was entered into the risk register on December 5th not 1/30 as implied in this risk write-up. 12/6/18, Keith Stock, Unisys: 13) The comment that the ASI vendor is requesting "additional environments" is misleading. The ASI vendor is requesting the number of environments as described in our proposal and subsequent contract. The recommendation that the ESI and ASI vendors work together to come up with an environment strategy that "will not incur additional cost to the State" may not be possible – recommend the recommendation be that a strategy be identified that minimizes additional.</p> | |
| 12 | Changes in direction regarding the preferred platform for portal development may impact project schedule and cost. [LifeRay vs. Adobe] | mfors | Finding - Risk | 11/28/2018 | Configuration and Development | <p>The project intends to utilize Adobe as the preferred platform for portal development, instead of LifeRay (which is currently used for the existing KOLEA portal platform), as the BES project web portal solution. Adobe Forms is currently out of scope for the BES portal but is in scope for BES PDF production. This decision represents a change in scope and requires a CR, which is currently in process. ASI has given DHS a Rough Order of Magnitude (ROM) estimate of \$2.8 million for this CR and has also provided a more details PIA. As of the date of this report, the Project is tracking this as a "Top Level Issue." It is unclear if DHS will be able to fund this CR or if it will involve de-scoping/scope swaps.</p> | <p>If DHS executes a change request to implement Adobe as the BES portal solution, there will be a significant impact to the project budget. The ASI has stated that if the portal platform is not decided soon there will be schedule impacts as they need to staff for the appropriate skillset. ASI has also stated they may begin developing a solution in LifeRay until a CR is executed to move to Adobe.</p> | <p>• DHS request more details from the ASI to better understand the details around such a high cost to move to an Adobe-based BES portal solution. • DHS request more details from the ASI to better understand the ASI's urgency to begin portal development now instead of focusing on other areas of design and development.</p> | Q1 2019 | 3 | 3 | Medium | Low | Open | <p>06/11/19 S Brown: The ASI disagrees with the finding that there is limited communication to the project on this item. It is statused on a weekly basis as part of the status report and meeting, with client agreement on status.</p> <p>03/13/2019 Bill Thornton, Unisys: Clarification has been provided to the composite rate applying to DDI enhancements with the existing technology stack. Adobe is a new technology and the composite rate does not apply. We will update the PIA with effort and the roles utilized.</p> | | | |
| 5 | The Project Partnership Understanding (PPU) for the BES Project has not been approved by CMS, which may impact the project schedule and funding. | Jolene | Finding - Risk | 11/26/2018 | Project Management | <p>The CMS Project Partnership Understanding (PPU) is not finalized between the State and CMS for this project. If funding is expected from CMS, they may require alignment to the MITA Framework, Gate Reviews and/or use of the Medicaid Eligibility and Enrollment Toolkit (MEET) Checklists. The MEET checklists are developed prior to the CMS gate reviews and are part of the Medicaid Eligibility and Enrollment Life Cycle (MEELC) that defines the CMS processes for Eligibility and Enrollment projects.</p> | <p>If the PPU is not finalized prior to the State's approval of the functional and technical requirements, the projects Federal funding may be at risk.</p> | <p>The State and CMS complete the PPU and the project incorporate all Federal reporting and process requirements into the appropriate project deliverables.</p> | Prior to Functional and Technical Requirement Approval. | 5 | 1 | Medium | Low | Open | | | | |

| Finding Number | Title | Reporter | Finding Type | Identified Date | Category | Observation | Significance | Recommendation | Event Horizon | Impact | Probability | Priority | Analyst Priority | Finding Status | Date Retired | Status Update | Client Comments | Vendor Comments |
|----------------|--|----------|----------------|-----------------|--------------------|--|---|---|---------------|--------|-------------|----------|------------------|----------------|--------------|--|---|-----------------|
| 2 | Late delivery of project deliverables may result in schedule delays. | Jolene | Finding - Risk | 11/28/2018 | Project Management | Based upon the project schedule dated 11/26/18 (refer to schedule for specifics), several due dates for project deliverables have been missed. As of the date of this report, these deliverables include the Project Management Plan (PMP), which is the formal document that is used to manage the execution of the project. In some instances, this risk may be compounded by a backlog of Deliverable Expectation Documents (DED) requiring approval and acceptance from the State. | Without a PMP that depicts all Project Management processes, the Project can suffer unplanned consequences in scope, schedule, cost, and quality parameters. Without a schedule that provides the required level of detail to manage the work, the project is at risk to be successful. | IVV recommends that the ASI complete the Project Management Plan deliverable, work with DHS and IVV for review and edit as needed, and attain approval of the PMP. This will help ensure that all processes within the project management entity are thoughtfully and collaboratively developed and implemented to meet the needs of the project. Review and update the project schedule to capture and discuss the late deliverables and tasks and delivery thereof; needed mitigation actions along with identification and agreement with DHS on DDI to resolve the late activities and tasks. | TBD | 4 | 2 | Medium | Med | Open | | 0/11/2019 - The number of late tasks in the schedule version (July 26, 2019) has been reduced to four tasks as reported by MS-Project Late Task Report. IVV acknowledges the ASI reviewed the critical path schedule with DHS and IVV this month and the ASI's positive changes to the schedule to include establishing the July 26, 2019 schedule as the baseline. In the schedule review meeting on 7/30/19 the ASI indicated the Conversion and KOLEA 90/10 Functionality schedules will be sub-plans to the Master Schedule, which are currently being updated by the ASI and not yet available for IVV to review. IVV will continue to monitor/review the schedules as they are published by the ASI and update this risk accordingly. 6/26/2019 - The Project Schedule (BI-05) dated 06/14/2019, posted to SharePoint on 06/18/2019 has 200 activities/tasks late as reported via the MS-Project Late Task Report. This accounts for eight percent of the total tasks in the schedule. Some of the late activities/tasks are project deliverables, some support the development of deliverables and overall work to be performed. Specific examples of late activities/tasks related to the project deliverables include: Develop MDM Architecture Discussion 1 Test Scenarios/Cases/Scripts/ALM Updates – Planned Finish – 3/29/2019 – zero percent complete Deliver MDM Architecture Requirements FDD to DHS – Planned Finish – 4/5/2019 – zero percent complete Develop BI-21 Updated and Completed Detailed Functional and Technical RTM – Planned Finish – 4/19/2019 – zero percent complete Develop Interoperability/Interfaces Standards Test | 6/11/19: The ASI and client are holding daily stand up meetings to review progress made that day, any issues identified and the plan for the following day. These meetings specifically review the schedule and review opportunities for pull in. The ASI and client are also holding weekly standup meetings with the entire team to review progress, issues, and activities coming up the following week with the objective of collaboration and joint ownership of the projects progress and schedule improvement. 3/13/19 Bill Thornton, Unisys: Specific to the PMP, the DED was approved by DHS on 1/15/2019 and the deliverable submitted on 1/21/2019. Specific to the project schedule, the DED was approved by DHS on 1/23/2019 and the deliverable is planned for submission the week of 3/18/2019. 2/6/19, Bill Thornton, Unisys: Executive Summary Risks Feedback The project schedule has been baselined but it needs to be re-baselined based on the approval dates of the DED's. Deliverable delays – as deliverables are not supposed to be started until the DED is approved, the deliverables are not delayed, they need to be re-baselined based on the DED approval. Findings and Recommendations (#2) – Project Management ASI submitted 19 deliverables and DEDs – Clarification – there | |